

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 5, 8 and 9, 12 and 13, were previously cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 6-7, 10-11 and 15-16 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Neilson (US Patent No. 5,399,892) and Tsoi (US Patent No. 5,631,484).

### **Independent Claim 10**

Section 6 of the Final Office Action acknowledges that Neilson does not disclose the process set of subsequently merging together the base region branches of adjacent cells adjacent and between said juxtaposed base region ends to form said single and substantially uniformly doped base region as set forth by Claim 10. The Final Office Action asserts that it would have been obvious to use the teachings of Tsoi to produce self-aligned base and source regions with a reduced number of masking steps. Whether or not this assertion is true, it is respectfully submitted that neither of Neilson or Tsoi teach subsequently merging together the base region branches of adjacent cells adjacent and between said juxtaposed base region ends to form said single and substantially uniformly doped base region as set forth by Claim 10.

In particular, the passage that Section 6 of the Final Office Action quotes in Tsoi at col 4 ln 7-9 refers to "the implanted dopant (*being*) diffused and activated using an appropriate anneal cycle." Notably Tsoi nowhere refers to "merging the base region branches of adjacent cells" as set forth by present claim 10. Section 6 of the Final Office Action asserts that in Tsoi: "A subsequent diffusion and activating merges the dopant between juxtaposed base contacts (col 4 ln 7-9) ..." It is respectfully submitted that the language "merges the dopant between juxtaposed base contacts" does not appear in Tsoi, that this language would not constitute merging branches of adjacent cells (as set forth by claim 10) and that this language would not constitute merging base region branches (as also set forth by claim 10).

Accordingly, it is submitted that the distinctions cited above between the teachings of the cited art and claim 10 are not obvious, and therefore Claim 10 is allowable.

The other claims remaining in the application depend from claim 10 and are submitted to be allowable at least for that reason. In addition, it is submitted that these claims each specify specific inventive features.

Accordingly, it is submitted that all the claims are allowable and issue of a patent on the application is solicited.

Although Applicants may disagree with other statements made by the Examiner in reference to the claims and the cited references, Applicants are not discussing all these statements in the current Office Action since reasons for the patentability of each pending claim are provided without addressing these statements. Therefore, Applicants reserve the right to address these statements at a later time if necessary.

If Applicant has overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079.


SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescall Semiconductor, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
David G. Dolezal  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 41,711  
Telephone: (512) 996-6839  
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854